

## **GEOMORPHOLOGY AND SOILS**

This report contains adequate information for the EIR/EIS section, however the impacts section requires some editing and reorganization. The Executive Summary is too general for use as the EIR/EIS section, however the impacts table is good and can be used as the basis for the EIR/EIS impacts analysis. Mitigation strategies are too general and need to be clarified as to what specific options are being recommended for each impact. Seismic and subsidence issues overlap the Flood Control report's levee stability discussion. Subsidence also overlaps with the groundwater report. It is recommended that that analysis be brought over to this section and the duplication eliminated.

# Conformance to Outline

## Geomorphology and Soils

### Affected Environment

- Conforms to outline

### Environmental Consequences

- page iii missing
- Current section 5.3 is extra
- Standard section 5.3 tables were not constructed correctly. For example, for the Delta there should be six rows with the six standards (Ecosystem restoration, Water Quality, etc.). Also, narrative is needed for each table.

**REVIEW COMMENTS**  
**CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM PEIS TECHNICAL REPORTS**  
**GEOMORPHOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY**

***AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT***

| <b>No.</b> | <b>Page/Para</b> | <b>Comment</b>   |
|------------|------------------|--|
| 1          | Summary          | The summary discussion is well-organized and concise but is not detailed enough for the PEIS. The report tile should include seismicity. The summary does not discuss the regulatory context.  |
| 2          | General          | Editorial comments were made to the text of the second edition (attached). Although revisions were made in the third edition, many of the second edition comments apply to the third edition. Therefore, little mark-up of the third edition was made.   |
| 3          | general          | The report is well organized and the information presented in a coherent fashion. It includes more detail than necessary to evaluate the programmatic level impacts, but there is not reason to reduce the amount of factual information presented in the report.  |
| 4          | general          | There is some overlap in coverage with the ground water report on the issue of subsidence. Subsidence is caused by ground water overdrafts, but has a geomorphologic expression. The two reports should be checked for consistency. It would be possible for one report to cite the other for some of this information, and this should be done in the PEIS. Another overlap occurs in the discussion of selenium in soils and in groundwater in the San Joaquin River Region (4.7.2.6). |

9/30/97

1

C - 0 0 4 1 9 2

C-004192

**REVIEW COMMENTS**  
**CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM PEIS TECHNICAL REPORTS**  
**GEOMORPHOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY**

***ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/ CONSEQUENCES***

| <b>No.</b> | <b>Page/Para</b>                | <b>Comment</b>  |
|------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 1          | Exec. Sum.                      | The Executive summary on pages 1-3 is not detailed enough for the PEIS. It refers to Table 1, Summary of Potential Significant Impacts, but does not discuss each of the impacts in enough detail to stand alone.   |
| 2          | General note                    | Some of the margin notes on the hard copy refer to material that could be used or not used in the PEIS. These notes should be ignored.  |
| 3          | Section 4.0, Assessment Methods | Should not be written in future tense. Describe the assessment methods used to analyze impacts in the report. The discussion could begin at Section 3.1 without loss of essential information. The discussion is too detailed for the programmatic level of analysis. |
| 4          | Significance Criteria           | The discussion of significance criteria is overly detailed.   |
| 5          |                                 |   |
| 6          |                                 |   |
| 7          |                                 |   |
| 8          |                                 |   |
| 9          |                                 |   |
| 10         |                                 |   |
| 11         |                                 |   |
| 12         |                                 |   |
| 13         |                                 |   |
| 14         |                                 |   |
| 15         |                                 |   |
| 16         |                                 |   |
| 17         |                                 |   |
| 18         |                                 |   |
| 19         |                                 |   |

9/30/97

2

**C - 0 0 4 1 9 3**

C-004193

**REVIEW COMMENTS**  
**CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM PEIS TECHNICAL REPORTS**  
**GEOMORPHOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY**

***ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS/ CONSEQUENCES***

| <b>No.</b> | <b>Page/Para</b>                | <b>Comment</b>  |
|------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 1          | Exec. Sum.                      | The Executive summary on pages 1-3 is not detailed enough for the PEIS. It refers to Table 1, Summary of Potential Significant Impacts, but does not discuss each of the impacts in enough detail to stand alone.   |
| 2          | General note                    | Some of the margin notes on the hard copy refer to material that could be used or not used in the PEIS. These notes should be ignored.  |
| 3          | Section 4.0, Assessment Methods | Should not be written in future tense. Describe the assessment methods used to analyze impacts in the report. The discussion could begin at Section 3.1 without loss of essential information. The discussion is too detailed for the programmatic level of analysis. |
| 4          | Significance Criteria           | The discussion of significance criteria is overly detailed.   |

9/30/97

2

**C - 0 0 4 1 9 4**

C-004194